Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

whose lips issue scrolls of all different colors except white; and all of different meanings but each ending "Such is Truth." As the wheel revolves, the objects and colors blend; and then it appears as stationary and white, the color of truth. As the different views of these writers move before us, we see indeed that "Such is the Law."

WILLIAM HERBERT PAGE.

University of Wisconsin.

The Monarchy in Politics. By JAMES ANSON FARRER. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company. 1917. Pp. ix, 342.)

Abundant and painstaking care has been bestowed on *The Monarchy in Politics*, and with only a little extension of the plan Mr. Farrer's book might have filled a gap in the constitutional history of Great Britain that has long existed, and has long been obvious. As it is the book lacks an adequate setting; and while it is a thoroughly acceptable and serviceable addition to the literature of English constitutional history, and particularly to the literature that is concerned with the evolution of the cabinet, it does not quite fulfill its title. Mr. Farrer's aim has been to trace the influence that the monarchy had on the policies of cabinets from the reign of George III to the reign of Victoria; and also to show, as he does with much interesting and informing detail, how tardily and reluctantly George III, George IV, William IV and Victoria accepted the doctrine of parliamentary government, and of the responsibility of the cabinet to the house of commons, and through the house of commons to the electorate. George III, as far as he could, repudiated this doctrine; and his successors accepted it only when it was forced upon them, and they realized that there was no alternative and no appeal.

But the phrase, "the monarchy in politics," implies much more than this; for domestic political questions have their origin in the constituencies; they are finally determined in the house of commons; and to influence or control politics with any effect or certainty the monarchy must be active in electioneering. It was active in the elections until the end of the reign of William IV. George III was the most active, the most venturesome, and, from his point of view, the most successful of the many English kings who engaged in what the Countess of Bessborough once described as "electioneering jockeying." In this country George III would be described as a party boss; and there has never been a boss in the municipal, state or federal politics of the United States who could

not have learned much in boss tactics from George III. Every English sovereign from at least as early as Henry VIII to William IV interfered in elections. Bossing by the crown, however, reached its zenith in the first twenty-five years of the reign of George III. It tapered off sharply in the reigns of George IV and William IV, and entirely disappeared after the accession of Queen Victoria, who never seems to have made the least attempt to interfere in a parliamentary election.

From the point of view of the present day conception of the constitutional position of the monarchy, the greatly lessened activity of George IV and William IV in electioneering, and the complete abandonment of all active interest in electioneering by Queen Victoria, were a great gain, which helped to mark the beginning of a new epoch in the constitutional history of England. But in Mr. Farrer's book no systematic attention is given to the activities of the crown in electioneering, and little or no notice is taken of the cessation of these activities. To this extent Mr. Farrer's book does not fulfill its title. It has been indicated that it lacks an adequate setting. It begins abruptly in the early years of the reign of George III, without the least reference to anything in English history that had happened before George III came to the throne. There is no preface and no introductory chapter. These are singular lacks in a book of this character.

To make the book fill the existing gap in the constitutional history of England—even to make it of wide service to ordinary students of constitutional history—there are needed (1) a sketch of the condition of the house of commons in the first thirty years of the reign of George III; (2) some statement of the great change in the position of the sovereign that resulted from the struggle with the Stuarts and the revolution of 1688; and (3) a sketch of the beginning of the modern cabinet, and at least a brief statement of the place at which the evolution of the cabinet had arrived when George III came to the throne, and, abandoning the attitude of his grandfather, George II, towards the cabinet, determined to make himself boss of Parliament—of the house of lords as well as of the house of commons—and by so doing established himself for a time as his own prime minister.

The evolution of the cabinet has been an exceedingly slow process. The history of its evolution from the reign of William III to the beginning of the great war, or to the end of Victoria's reign, is really the story of how the cabinet, responsible to the house of commons, and dependent from day to day on a majority in that house, slowly and toilsomely drew to itself powers that were once the prerogative of the crown. This

process had been going on steadily from the reign of William III to the end of the reign of George II. It was checked, and, moreover, some ground that had been gained was lost in the reign of George III; and progress towards the cabinet as it now exists was not resumed until April, 1835, when William IV was compelled to recall Melbourne and the Whigs, whom he had dismissed in November, 1834. Melbourne, as Mr. Farrer brings out with admirable clearness, was then in a position to insist on terms. These were: (1) that no more members of the royal household whose opinions were hostile to the government should be selected from either the house of commons or the house of lords; (2) that there should be a creation of peers to counterbalance additions made to the house of lords by Peel; and (3) that William IV should give his preliminary consent to the Irish tithes bill—agree to give his assent to it after it was passed, and also his support to its progress through Parliament. Mr. Farrer entitles the chapter describing the establishment of this landmark of 1835 in the history of the evolution of the cabinet "William the Conquered," and in his narrative of the episode he writes "the minister prevailed, and the king was conquered." But there were many struggles yet to come with Queen Victoria; and in these struggles the queen displayed, for a time at any rate, nearly as much obstinacy and toryism as regards the crown and its prerogatives as had been displayed by George III.

From the point of view of steady and continuous progress in the evolution of the cabinet, the queen, in the early years of her reign, fell into the hands of unfortunate tutors. Stockmar, King Leopold of Belgium, and the Prince Consort were intent on exalting the crown, and diminishing the importance of the cabinet and the house of commons. The queen, moreover, was always an apt and willing pupil when tutors were instilling into her the importance of parting with none of the powers that the crown had exercised by virtue of the prerogative. Struggles developed at one time in connection with domestic legislation; at another with the control of the army; and at others with the civil service. Most of the struggles, however, developed out of foreign policy; for the queen was intensely German in her sympathies and antagonistic to any policy which might tend to thwart the ambitions of Prussia or diminish the importance of Austria. These numerous conflicts are traced in detail by Mr. Farrer, who in treating of the four reigns—George III, George IV, William IV and Victoria—has drawn with fullness and success on the letters and memoirs of nearly every statesman of these one hundred and forty years.

By far the largest part of the book is devoted to the reign of Victoria. The reasons for this are obvious. Many questions in which the monarch and cabinets differed came to the front in the reign of the queen; and with the continuous movement in Great Britain towards democracy, ministers became more insistent that power must rest with the cabinet, because the transfer of power from the crown to the cabinet was in accord with their conception of government by Parliament, and because they realized that the constituencies would support them in this position. Another obvious reason for the detail that characterizes the treatment of this reign is the existence in print of the queen's letters of the period from 1837 to 1861, and the ample proportions of the published letters and memoirs of nearly all the statesmen of the Victorian era.

Excellent use has been made of all this material by Mr. Farrer, and of similar material of the reigns of George III, George IV and William IV. Mr. Farrer has drawn singularly little on the writings of the constitutional historians. He makes no mention, either in the text or in the bibliography, of the noteworthy series of articles on the crown and the cabinet that Dunckley, under the nom de plume of Verax, wrote for the *Manchester Weekly Times*, when the third volume of Martin's *Life of Prince Consort* was published in 1878, articles that were republished in book form in the same year entitled *Letters of Verax*. Moreover, he seems unaware that in some histories of the house of commons considerable attention has been bestowed on the crown in politics. It is like looking a gift horse in the mouth to suggest shortcomings in Mr. Farrer's book; for it is an unusually interesting book on an exceedingly interesting subject, and a noteworthy contribution to the history of the relations of the crown and cabinet from 1760 to the end of the nineteenth century.

EDWARD PORRITT.

Hartford, Conn.

Leading Cases on International Law. By LAWRENCE B. EVANS. (Chicago: Callaghan and Company. 1917. Pp. 477.)

To the teaching of that part of international law which may be taught by means of judicial decisions, the work under review constitutes a useful aid. Beginning with Snow's well-known collection, several case books have been published, the best known of which is the voluminous compilation of Scott. In England the collection of Pitt Cobbett (3d